Serial No. 10/660,690
Reissue of U.S. Patent No. 6,288,693
Amendment dated August 4, 2008
Reply to Office Action of February 4, 2008

As the Patent Office may be aware, paragraph (a) relates to the reissue declaration up to the time of filing the oath or declaration, e.g., at the time of filing the reissue application. Paragraph (b) relates to errors corrected during the prosecution and the requirements of a supplemental oath or declaration. In the Office Action dated August 23, 2006, the oath/declaration was rejected under 37 C.F.R. §1.175(a); and thereafter, arguments were presented in the Reply filed February 22, 2007 that the oath/declaration was not defective and the rejection was overcome. Hence, the issue for the oath/declaration up to the filing of the oath or declaration under subsection (a) is moot.

In regard to the rejection under 37 C.F.R. §1.175(b) requiring a supplemental oath or declaration, such basis set forth in the Office Action is erroneous. As set forth in paragraph (b)(i), a supplemental oath is required only if any errors corrected are not covered by the oath or declaration submitted under paragraph (a). The Patent Office desires a supplemental oath or declaration based upon amendments made to the claims reciting additional features during the prosecution. However, it is respectfully submitted that such supplemental oath or declaration is not required since the original oath or declaration, which complies with paragraph (a), still covers the error being corrected. As the Patent Office may be aware, claims 17 and 24 are plasma display panel claims compared to original issued claims directed to method claims, and method 8 is still broader in the aspect that it does not recite "simultaneous" and "synchronization"

Serial No. 10/660,690

Reissue of U.S. Patent No. 6,288,693

Amendment dated August 4, 2008

Reply to Office Action of February 4, 2008

compared to original claim 1. Further, subsection (c) of the 37 C.F.R. §1.175 clarifies that a

supplemental oath or declaration is not required, contrary to the reasons set forth in the Office

Action. As set forth in subsection (c) as follows:

"Having once stated an error upon which the reissue is based, as set forth in paragraph

(a)(1), unless all errors previously stated in the oath or declaration are no longer being corrected,

a subsequent oath or declaration under paragraph (b) of this section need not specifically identify

any other error or errors being corrected."

In view of the fact that the original oath or declaration, which complies with paragraph

(a) of 37 C.F.R. §1.175, and such an error is still corrected in the amended claims, no

supplemental oath or declaration is required. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection under 35

U.S.C. §251 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION** 

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the

application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are

earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better

condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Daniel

Y.J. Kim, at the telephone number listed below.

3

Serial No. 10/660,690 Reissue of U.S. Patent No. 6,288,693 Amendment dated August 4, 2008 Reply to Office Action of February 4, 2008

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

> Respectfully submitted, KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

Maniel y. D. Kind

Daniel Y.J. Kim

Registration No. 36,186

Correspondence Address:

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, VA 20153-1200

703 766-3777 DYK/dak

Date: August 4, 2008